



CITY OF LONG BEACH

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND BUILDING

333 West Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor

Long Beach, CA 90802

FAX (562) 570-6753

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING

\$25.00 FILING FEE

NOTICE OF PREPARATION

To: Office of the County Clerk
Environmental Filings
12400 E. Imperial Highway, #1101
Norwalk, CA 90650

From: Community & Environmental Planning Division
Department of Planning and Building
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Date Mailed:

In conformance with Section 15082 of the State CEQA Guidelines, please post this notice for period of 20 days. Enclosed is the required fee of \$25.00 for processing.

Notice is hereby given that the Long Beach City Planning Commission, Lead Agency for purposes of CEQA, proposes to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project listed below:

1. **Project Location:**

2. **Project Title:**

3. **Project Description:**

4. Review period during which the Lead Agency will receive comments on the proposed mitigated Negative Declaration:

Starting Date:

Ending Date:

5. Public Meeting of the Planning Commission

Date:

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Location: City Council Chambers
Long Beach City Hall
333 West Ocean Boulevard, Plaza Level

6. Copies of the report and all referenced documents are available for review by contacting the undersigned.
7. The site is not on any list as enumerated under Section 65965.5 of the California Government Code.
8. The Initial Study may find significant adverse impacts to occur to the following resource areas:
9. The Negative Declaration has no significant impacts to occur.

For additional information contact:

333 West Ocean Boulevard, Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

CITY OF LONG BEACH
PLANNING COMMISSION

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT:

I. TITLE:

II. PROPONENT

III. DESCRIPTION

IV. LOCATION

V. HEARING DATE & TIME

VI. HEARING LOCATION

City Council Chambers
Long Beach City Hall
333 West Ocean Boulevard, Plaza Level

FINDING*:

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, the Long Beach City Planning Commission has conducted an Initial Study to determine whether the following project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment. On the basis of that study, the Commission hereby finds that the proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment and does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report because the Mitigation Measures described in the initial study have been added to the project.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

- * If you wish to appeal the appropriateness or adequacy of this document, address your written comments to our finding that the project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment: (1) identify the environmental effect(s), why they would occur, and why they would be significant, and (2) suggest any mitigation measures which you believe would eliminate or reduce the effect to an acceptable level. Regarding item (1) above, explain the basis for your comments and submit any supporting data or references.

This document and supporting attachments are provided for review by the general public. This is an information document about environmental effects only. Supplemental information is on file and may be reviewed in the office listed above. The decision making body will review this document and potentially many other sources of information before considering the proposed project.

INITIAL STUDY

Prepared by:

City of Long Beach
Community and Environmental Planning
333 West Ocean Boulevard, Fifth Floor
Long Beach, California 90802

INITIAL STUDY

- 1. Project title:**
- 2. Lead agency name and address:**
- 3. Contact person and phone number:**
- 4. Project location:**
- 5. Project sponsor's name and address:**
- 6. General Plan:**
- 7. Zoning:**

8. Description of project:

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required:

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

Aesthetics	Agriculture Resources	Air Quality
Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	Geology/Soils
Hazards & Hazardous Materials	Hydrology/Water Quality	Land Use/Planning
Mineral Resources	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System	Noise
Population/Housing	Public Services	Recreation
Transportation	Utilities/Service Systems	Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the Environment and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. **A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENT IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parenthesis following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less than Significant with A Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration Section 1 5063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated", describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES – In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?				
III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?
- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?
- e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section §15064.5?
- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section §15064.5?
- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
- d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
 - i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.
 - ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
 - iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including Liquefaction?
 - iv) Landslides?
- b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
- c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS –

Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?
- c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
- d) Be located on a site, which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?
- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
f) Otherwise degrade water quality?				
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

- a) Physically divide an established community?
- b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?
- c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

XI. NATIONAL POLLUTION DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM – Would the project:

- a) Result in a significant loss of pervious surface?
- b) Create a significant discharge of pollutants into the storm drain or water way?
- c) Violate any best management practices of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit?

XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
- b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?
- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- a) Fire protection?
- b) Police protection?
- c) Schools?
- d) Parks?
- e) Other public facilities?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. RECREATION –				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				
d) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				
g) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS –				
Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlement and resources, or are new or expanded entitlement needed?				
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?
- c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS

EXISTING SETTING

This project is located to the North of the Downtown Long Beach Urban Core on Pine Ave. The surrounding area is a mix of neighborhood serving retail, small office, and residential.

A. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

The development of the proposed site will not have an impact on scenic vistas. The Local Coastal Program of the General Plan does not identify any scenic areas where the proposed development is located.

B. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

The proposed development is located in a highly urbanized area with few natural scenic resources, with the notable exception of Pacific Ocean scenic views. The Local Coastal Program of the General Plan does not identify any scenic areas where the proposed development is located.

C. Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

The proposed use would occupy an existing one-story office building and would not affect the visual character of the site.

D. Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

The proposed use would occupy an existing one-story office building and would not create a new source of substantial light or glare.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

EXISTING SETTING

The project site is not located within an agricultural zone, and there are no agricultural zones within the vicinity of the project. The proposed project is located within a section of the city that has been developed for over 40 years. Development of the proposed project will have no effect on agricultural resources within the City of Long Beach or any other neighboring city or county.

The proposal will have no effect upon agriculture resources.

III. AIR QUALITY

EXISTING SETTING

The South Coast Air Basin is subject to possibly some of the worst air pollution in the country, attributable mainly to its topography, climate, meteorological conditions, a large population base, and highly dispersed urban land use patterns.

Air quality conditions are primarily affected by the rate and location of pollutant emissions and by climatic conditions that influence the movement and dispersion of pollutants. Atmospheric conditions such as wind speed, wind direction, and air temperature gradients, along with local and regional topography, provide the links between air pollutant emissions and air quality.

The South Coast Air Basin generally has a limited capability to disperse air contaminants because of its low wind speeds and persistent temperature inversions. In the Long Beach area, predominantly daily winds consist of morning onshore airflow from the southwest at a mean speed of 7.3 miles per hour and afternoon and evening offshore airflow from the northwest at 0.2 to 4.7 miles per hour with little variability between seasons. Summer wind speeds average slightly higher than winter wind speeds. The prevailing winds carry air contaminants northward and then eastward over Whittier, Covina, Pomona and Riverside.

The majority of pollutants normally found in the Los Angeles County atmosphere originate from automobile exhausts as unburned hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, oxides of nitrogen and other materials. Of the five major pollutant types (carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides,

reactive organic gases, sulfur oxides, and particulates), only sulfur oxide emissions are dominated by sources other than automobile exhaust.

A. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Attainment Plan?

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has determined that if a project is consistent with the growth forecasts for the subregion in which it is located, it is consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) and regional emissions are mitigated by the control strategy specified in the AQMP. By the year 2010, preliminary population projections by SCAG indicate that Long Beach will grow by 27,682 residents or six percent to a population of 491,092. There are no dwelling units included in the proposed development, thus it is consistent with these projections.

B. Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?

The California Air Resources Board regulates mobile emissions and oversees the activities of county Air Pollution Control Districts (APCDs) and regional Air Quality Management Districts (AQMDs) in California. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is the regional agency empowered to regulate stationary and mobile sources in the South Coast Air Basin.

To determine whether a project generates sufficient quantities of air pollution to be considered significant, the SCAQMD adopted maximum thresholds of significance for mobile and stationary producers in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) (i.e., cars, trucks, buses and energy consumption). SCAQMD Conformity Procedures (Section 6.3 of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook, April 1993) states that all government actions that generate emission greater than the following thresholds are considered regionally significant (see Table 1).

Table 1. SCAQMD Significance Thresholds

Pollutant	Construction Thresholds (lbs/day)	Operational Thresholds (lbs/day)
ROC	75	55
NO _x	100	55
CO	550	550
PM ₁₀	150	150
SO _x	150	150

Construction emissions do not apply as there is no proposed construction. The source of these estimates are based on CEQA Air Quality Handbook, revised 1993, Table 9-1 Screening Table for Estimating Total Construction Emissions. The table below indicates the results.

Table 2. Construction Emissions

	ROC	NO _x	CO	PM ₁₀
Exhaust Emissions	0	0	0	0
AQMD Thresholds	75	100	550	150
Exceeds Thresholds	No	Yes	No	No

Estimated automobile emissions from the project are listed in the table below. The source of these estimates are based on CEQA Air Quality Handbook, revised 1993, Table 9-7 Screening Table for Estimating Mobile Source Operation Emissions. The primary source of operational emissions is vehicle trips of which this project is unlikely to produce significant new vehicle trips. Please also see XV (a) and (b) supra for discussion. Based on these estimates the proposed project does not exceed threshold levels for mobile emissions. The table below indicates the results.

Table 3: Operation Emissions

	ROC	NO _x	CO	PM ₁₀
Exhaust Emissions	6.6	2.9	60.0	.6
Energy	0.0007	.0875	0.0152	0.003
AQMD Thresholds	55	55	550	150
Exceeds Thresholds	No	No	No	No

C. Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

The Federal Clean Air Act prohibits Federal agencies, or the Metropolitan Planning Organization, which is SCAG, from supporting in any way, or approving any activity that does not conform to AQMD.

Therefore, if a project is consistent with the AQMD as approved by the Federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the project is in "conformity" with the Federal Clean Air Act. The proposed project is consistent with the AQMD and so is in conformance with the EPA. In addition, the AQMD sets standards which reflect the California Clean Air Act. No significant impact is anticipated.

D. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

The CEQA Air Quality Handbook defines sensitive receptors as children, athletes, elderly, and sick that are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than the population at large. Although the project will involve children, the proposal is not anticipated to produce significant levels of any emission that could affect sensitive receptors.

E. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

The project is not anticipated to create any objectionable odors.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Existing Setting:

The proposed project site is located within a highly urbanized portion of the city, and adjacent to commercial land uses. The site is completely paved. There is no evidence of rare or sensitive species as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations or Title 50 of the Federal Code of Regulations.

The proposed site is not located in a protected wetlands area. Also, the development of the site is not anticipated to interfere with the migratory movement of any wildlife species. The biological habitat and species diversity is limited to the fact that typically not found in highly populated and urbanized Southern California settings.

No adverse impacts are anticipated to biological resources.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

There is some evidence to indicate that primitive people inhabited portions of the city as early as 5,000 to 2,000 B.C. Much of the remains and artifacts of these ancient people have been destroyed as the city has been

developed. Of the archaeological sites remaining, many of them seem to be located in the southeast sector of the city.

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section §15064.5?

The site is not known to be a historic resource, therefore no historic resource will be affected.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section §15064.5?

This area is not known for archaeological resources sites. In addition, the site is located outside the area of the city expected to have the higher probability of latent artifacts. Furthermore, no construction is proposed.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Please see VII (b) supra for discussion.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Please see VII (b) supra for discussion.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

No faults are known to pass beneath the site, and the area is not in the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone. The most significant fault system in the vicinity is the Newport-Inglewood fault zone. Other Potentially active faults in the area are the Richfield Fault, the Marine Stadium Fault, the Palos Verdes Fault and the Los Alamitos Fault.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

The project's proximity to the Newport-Inglewood fault zone indicates the project area may be exposed to greater than normal seismic risks. However, the project does not involve any new construction.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including Liquefaction?

The project is outside the area for a potential liquefaction based on Seismic Safety Element of the City's General Plan.

iv) Landslides?

No landslides are known to exist on the project site, nor is the area in the path of an existing or potential landslide.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Please see IV (b) supra for discussion

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

The project site is not subject to liquefaction or to landslide activity.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

The project does not involve any new construction.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

Sewers are available to the project.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

A. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

There is no record of evidence of any hazards or hazardous materials in or around the project site nor will this site be a source or distribution for hazardous materials.

B. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Please see VII (a) supra for discussion.

C. Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Please see VII (a) supra for discussion.

D. Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

The Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List is a planning document used by the State, local agencies and developers to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements in providing information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. Cortese List does not list the proposed development site as contaminated with hazardous materials. In fact, the two Long Beach sites are Ocean Boulevard and Harbor Scenic Drive and 2160 East Dominguez Street.

E. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

The proposed project site is not located within the airport land use plan or private airstrip.

F. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Please see VII (e) supra for discussion.

G. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The proposed project will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

H. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?

The proposed site is within an urbanized setting and will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The Flood Insurance Administration has prepared a new Flood Hazard Map designating potential flood zones, (Based on the projected inundation limits for breach of the Hansen Dam and that of the Whittier Narrows Dam, as well as the 100-year flood as delineated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) which was adopted in July 1998.

a) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Development of the proposed project will not violate wastewater discharge standards. The proposed project would comply with all state and federal requirements pertaining to preservation of water quality. The site is in an urbanized area, which is not adjacent to any major water source.

The wastewater flow originating from the proposed project will discharge in to a local (Long Beach) sewer line, for conveyance to the Los Angeles County Sanitation District treatment.

Because the project is within the SCAG projected growth, it is expected that the amount of wastewater produced can be dealt with by County Sanitation. No significant impact expected.

b) Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local

groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

The project does not involve any construction that would affect the groundwater table in the area. Project operations would not be expected to adversely affect groundwater supplies. Developments exceeding certain levels, as specified in SB 221 and SB 610, require the Water Department to make formal assessment of these matters for those specific projects. For other projects the Water Department believes it has sufficient current and planned entitlements to meet their drinking water needs.

- c) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?**

The project sites are within a highly urbanized area with Stormwater drainage infrastructure in place. The City has a storm drain network operated and maintained by the Long Beach Public Works Department, and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. The storm drain network is characterized by an extensive network of subsurface trunk lines, laterals, catch basins, and pumping stations. Some portions of the City drain naturally and do not contain storm drain infrastructure. Where infrastructure exists, the system functions to collect storm drainage and runoff for discharge into the local flood control channels. Runoff from the site is not expected to exceed the capacity of the local storm drain system.

- d) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?**

Please see VIII (b) supra for discussion.

- e) Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?**

Please see VIII (b) supra for discussion.

- f) Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?**

The proposed project will not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area. It is designated as Zone X by the FEMA FIRM maps, dated February 5, 2000.

- g) Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?**

The proposed site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area.

- h) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?**

The proposed project is not within a zone influenced by the inundation of seiche, tsunami, or mudflow as shown in the Long Beach Seismic Element.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

- a) Would the project physically divide an established community?**

The project site will not divide an established community because it is consistent with surrounding mix of residential and commercial uses in the downtown urban core.

- b) Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

The General Plan designation for this site is Land Use District 4, high density residential district. Day care can be a complimentary use to high-density residential and is not incompatible with the surrounding area that s developed with a mix of residential and neighborhood serving commercial uses.

The site is located in the R-4-N (high density residential) zoning district. Chapter 21 (Zoning Code) of the City of Long Beach Municipal Code requires a Conditional Use Permit for a Day Care Center with 15 or more children in the R-4-N zone. However, as this is a re-

establishment of a non-conforming use, instead an Administrative Use Permit is required.

Mitigation Measures:

Administrative Use Permit shall be obtained to permit a Day Care Center in an R-4-N zone.

c) Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?

There is no specific conservation plan for the proposed site.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

The primary mineral resource within the City of Long Beach has been oil. From the beginning of this century, oil extraction operations within the city have diminished as this resource has become depleted due to extraction operations. Today oil extraction continues but on a much reduced scale in comparison to that which occurred in the past. The proposed site does not contain any oil extraction operations and development is not anticipated to have a negative impact on this resource. There are no other known mineral resources on the site that could be negatively impacted by development.

No adverse impacts are anticipated to mineral resources.

XI. National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)

a) Result in a significant lose of pervious surface?

The proposed development will not entail replacing a pervious surface thus there will not be a loss of pervious surface.

b) Create a significant discharge of pollutants into the storm drain or water way?

According to the California Regional Water Quality Board, NPDES Permit #CAS004003, Water Discharge Requirements for Municipal Storm Water and Urban Runoff Discharge within the City of Long Beach, Commercial projects built with more than 100,000 square feet of impervious ground area are subject to NPDES. The site area of this project is less than 100,000 square feet of impervious area. The

proposed development will not entail replacing a pervious surface thus there will not be a loss of pervious surface.

One of the goals of NPDES is to substantially reduce the discharge of pollutants into the storm drain systems. Although, the project contains less than 100,000 square feet of impervious surface (on the ground) it must adhere to NPDES best practices. No significant impact is anticipated.

c) Violate any best management practices of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit?

The project must comply to NPDES standards during construction and in the operational phase.

XII. NOISE

Noise is defined as unwanted sound that disturbs human activity. Environmental noise levels typically fluctuate over time, and different types of noise descriptors are used to account for this variability. Measuring noise levels involves intensity, frequency, and duration, as well as time of occurrence.

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to ambient noise levels than other uses, due to the amount of noise exposure and the types of activities involved. Residences, motels, hotels, schools, libraries, churches, nursing homes, auditoriums, parks and outdoor recreation areas are generally more sensitive to noise than are commercial and industrial land uses.

The City of Long Beach uses the State Noise/Land Use Compatibility Standards, which suggests a desirable exterior noise exposure at 65 dBA CNEL for sensitive land uses such as residences. Less sensitive commercial and industrial uses may be compatible with ambient noise levels up to 70 dBA. The City of Long Beach has an adopted Noise Ordinance that sets exterior and interior noise standards. The project area is located in District 2 of the Noise District Map, which sets daytime (7AM - 10PM) exterior noise limits to 60 dBA and night (10PM -7AM) exterior noise limits to 55 dBA.¹

a) Would the project exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?

Development of the proposed project is not expected to create noise levels in excess of those established by the Long Beach City Ordinance.

b) Would the project exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

Once the project is completed ground borne noise generation should be limited to additional vehicular traffic. No significant ground borne vibration or ground borne noise impacts are expected.

c) Would the project create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Ambient noise levels in the general vicinity of the proposed project sight are not anticipated to increase significantly. Adjacent to the project site, a mix of commercial, residential, and educational uses exist on the block. The project site is located between Pine and Pacific Avenues. Pacific Avenue is a major arterial that generates a considerable amount of ambient noise, the project is not expected to contribute to significant additional noise to the ambient noise level in the area.

Mitigation Measure:

No noise should be created on site that would exceed District 2 Noise levels by more than allowed in Section 8.80.150 of the Long Beach Municipal Code.

d) Would the project create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Ambient noise levels in the general vicinity of the proposed project sight are not anticipated to increase significantly, however there is the possibility that noise created by children on an outdoor play area may be a disturbance to adjacent residential properties during sensitive hours.

Mitigation Measure:

Children shall be allowed on the outdoor play area only between 8:00 a.m. and 6:30 p.m.

- e) **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

The proposed development is not located within the airport land use plan.

- f) **For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area excessive noise levels?**

See discussion XI (e) supra.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Existing Conditions:

The City of Long Beach is the second largest city in Los Angeles County and the fifth largest in California. According to the 2000 Census, Long Beach has a population of 461,522, which presents a 7.5 percent increase from the 1990 Census.

According to the 2000 Census, there were 163,088 housing units in Long Beach, with a citywide vacancy rate of 6.32 percent.

It is projected that a total population of approximately 499,705 persons will inhabit the City of Long Beach by the year 2010. The proposed project is not anticipated to have any significant impact on the population of the City of Long Beach or housing demand.

- a) **Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses or indirectly (for example, thorough extension of roads or other infrastructure)?**

The proposed project will not add any housing units, thus no population or housing growth would be directly associated with the project. No significant impact is anticipated.

- b) **Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement of housing elsewhere?**

The project site is currently developed as a one story office building: No people will be displaced.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Fire protection?

Fire protection is provided by the Long Beach Fire Department. The Department has 23 in-city stations. The Department is divided into Fire Prevention, Fire Suppression, Bureau of Instruction, and the Bureau of Technical Services. The Fire Department is accountable for medical, paramedic, and other first aid rescue calls from the community.

The site is principally served by Fire Station No. 3, which is located at 1222 Daisy Avenue. However, any fire unit in the system may respond to the project locations depending on need and availability. No impacts are anticipated.

b) Police protection?

The Long Beach Police Department serves the project site. The Department is divided into Patrol, Traffic, Detective, Juvenile, Vice, Community, Jail, Records, and Administration Sections. The City has four Patrol Divisions; East, West, North and South. The project is served by the South Division, located at Magnolia and Broadway, temporarily housed at Long Beach Boulevard and Elm in the East Village. No impacts are anticipated.

c) Schools?

The proposed project will not add any permanent housing units, thus will not have an impact on schools.

d) Parks?

The closest park to the project site is Drake Park. The project includes an outdoor play area to be used by the children on site. No significant impact is anticipated.

d) Other public facilities?

Other public facilities are not expected to be impacted.

XV. RECREATION

Development of the proposed project is not expected to place an increased burden on the recreational facilities of the city.

A. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

See discussion supra XIII (d).

B. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

The project will include a play area on site which is not anticipated to cause a adverse physical effect on the environment.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Existing Conditions:

Since 1980, Long Beach has experienced significant growth. Continued growth is expected into the next decade. Inevitably, growth will generate additional demand for travel. Without proper planning and necessary transportation improvements, this increase in travel demand, if unmanaged, could result in gridlock on freeways and streets, and jeopardize the tranquility of residential neighborhoods.

Any project that results in the degradation of an intersection to LOS E or F is considered to significantly impact that location. If an intersection is projected to operate at LOS E or F before the addition of project traffic, then the project has a significant impact if it causes the intersection volume/capacity ratio to increase by more than .02

A. Would the project cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

The load capacity of Pacific and Pine Avenues are expected to be sufficient to handle the increased number of trips due to the Child Care Use. This project will also use the alleys Solana Court and Nardo Way

to access the rear of the site where the loading spaces are proposed. The impact is anticipated to be at a level below significant.

B. Would the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

While the project does have the potential to create an increase in the number of vehicle trips, the number of new trips anticipated by this use is not anticipated to create a significant impact.

C. Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

This development is unrelated to air traffic.

D. Would the project substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

No impact is expected. The site is in an urbanized area and the streets are oriented in a grid pattern.

E. Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?

For Day Care uses, the Long Beach Municipal Code requires one parking space per every 10 children, plus 2 loading and unloading spaces. For a project of this size (40 Children), the Municipal code requires 4 parking spaces and 2 loading and unloading spaces. The project proposes a total of 6 parking spaces, 2 to be designated as loading and unloading spaces. If the project meets code required parking, no significant impacts on parking capacity are anticipated.

F. Would the project conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

The proposed project will have no impact on policies supporting alternative transportation.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

The proposed project is not expected to place an undue burden on any utility or service system.

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

Because the project is well within SCAG forecasts of population growth in the region, the project will not exceed wastewater capacity as defined by the County Sanitation District of Los Angeles County. No significant impact is expected.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

No significant impact is expected based on the discussion above.

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Based on the Long Beach Storm Water Master Plan, Long Beach has adequate storm water drainage facilities to service the project.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlement and resources, or are new or expanded entitlement needed?

According to the Long Beach Water Department, sufficient water supplies will be available in the 20 years to service the project.

d) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

See discussion, *supra* XVI (a) and XII (a).

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

Solid waste from the project operations can be disposed of at the transformation facility, SERFF, located in Long Beach. In addition, Puente Hills Landfill is located approximately 20 miles from the site and has sufficient capacity. No significant impacts are anticipated.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

As projected by the Los Angeles County, shortfall in permitted daily landfill capacity may be experienced in the County within the next few years. However, the impacts expected are less than significant.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

The proposed project is within a well-established urbanized setting; there is no anticipated negative impact to any known fish or wildlife habitat or species.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

The proposed project is not anticipated to have a cumulative considerable effect on the environment.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

There are no adverse environmental effects to human life either directly or indirectly related to the proposed project.

MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN

LAND USE AND PLANNING

Measure 1: An Administrative Use Permit shall be obtained to permit a Day Care Center in an R-4-N zone.

Timing: Prior to issuance of Building Permits

Enforcement Agency: Planning Bureau

NOISE

Measure 2: No noise should be created on site that would exceed District 2 Noise levels by more than allowed in Section 8.80.150 of the Long Beach Municipal Code.

Timing: Ongoing

Enforcement Agency: City Noise Control Officer

Measure 3: Children shall be allowed on the outdoor play area only between 8:00 a.m. and 6:30 p.m.

Timing: Ongoing

Enforcement Agency: City Noise Control Officer